



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

RECEIVED

JUN 07 2004

Technology Center 2100

In re application of: Duperrouzel et al.

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

Application No. 09/124,468

Filed: July 28, 1998

Confirmation No. 6731

For: WEB PAGE DISPLAY SYSTEM

Examiner: Cao (Kevin) Nguyen

Art Unit: 2173

Attorney Reference No. 3382-65527

I hereby certify that this paper and the documents referred to as being attached or enclosed herewith are being deposited with the United States Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS, COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS, P.O. BOX 1450, ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below.

Attorney
for Applicant(s)

G. L. Hawer

Date Mailed June 1, 2004

MAIL STOP APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. BOX 1450
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22313-1450

APPEAL BRIEF

This brief is in furtherance of the Notice of Appeal filed February 24, 2004, and received March 1, 2004. The fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(c) is enclosed.

06/03/2004 SDENB0B1 00000002 09124468
01 FC:1402 330.00 OP
02 FC:1251 110.00 OP

CONTENTS

I.	REAL PARTY IN INTEREST.....	4
II.	RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	4
III.	STATUS OF CLAIMS	4
IV.	STATUS OF AMENDMENTS.....	4
V.	SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION.....	5
VI.	ISSUES	5
	A. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claims 1-23 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)	5
	B. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claims 25-35 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)	6
	C. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claim 24 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e)	6
VII.	GROUPING OF CLAIMS	6
VIII.	ARGUMENT.....	6
	A. The Cited Art – U.S. Patent 6,119,135 to Helfman (“Helfman”).....	6
	B. Rejections of Claims 1-23 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)	7
	1. Independent Claim 1 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman.....	7
	a. Helfman’s Passage About Displaying Web Page Images Does Not Describe Display Areas Along with a Sizing Control Operable by a User to Simultaneously Adjust the Display Area Sizes While Maintaining Their Collective Size	8
	b. Helfman’s Passage on a Plurality of Images from Web Pages Does Not Describe a Plurality of Display Areas Configured to Display Web Pages	10
	2. Independent Claims 9 and 19 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman	11
	3. Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-18, and 20-23 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman....	11
	C. Rejections of Claims 25-30 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)	12
	1. Independent Claim 25 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman.....	12
	a. Helfman’s Passage on the Use of Lists of URLs Does Not Describe Display Areas Each Displaying a Web Page from a List of Web Page Sites.....	12

b. Helfman's Passage About a Plurality of Images Does Not Describe a Plurality of Display Areas Configured to Independently Display a Web Page	13
2. Independent Claim 30 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman.....	13
3. Dependent Claims 26-29 and 31-35 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman	14
D. Rejection of Claim 24 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)	14
IX. CONCLUSION	15
APPENDIX A: CLAIMS ON APPEAL.....	16

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

The real party in interest is Microsoft Corporation, by an assignment from the Seed Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC recorded at Reel 013704, Frames 0685 *et seq.* Seed Intellectual Property Law Group PLLC received an assignment from Katiesoft, Inc., recorded at Reel 012526, Frames 0027 *et seq.* Katiesoft, Inc. received an assignment from the inventors, recorded at Reel 9493, Frames 0925 *et seq.*

Microsoft Corporation is a Washington corporation having a place of business at One Microsoft Way, Redmond, Washington, 98052.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

No other appeals or interferences relate to the present application.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-35 have been rejected and remain appealed.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

An Amendment was filed on September 24, 2003, responsive to an Examiner interview of September 12, 2003, which indicated a likelihood of allowance if the suggested Amendment were filed. A Final Office Action was mailed on September 25, 2003, which did not enter the Amendment. A Response After Final Office Action was then filed on November 20, 2003, referring to the earlier Amendment. An Advisory Action, mailed December 17, 2003, refused entry of the Amendment.

Separately, an IDS filed August 19, 2003, has apparently not been considered by the Examiner.

Thus, for the purpose of Appeal the claims will be presented as they appeared after the entry of a Preliminary Amendment of August 12, 1999, which added new claims, and after which no further amendments were entered. Additionally, an Amendment After Appeal is filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief in order to correct a typographical error in claim 23 which was not corrected when the September 24, 2003, Amendment was not entered. The error is corrected in the listing of claims on appeal in the Appendix to this Appeal Brief.

V. SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

The claims include those directed to a display system for displaying web pages in a plurality of non-overlapping display areas with a sizing control that allows a user to simultaneously control the sizes of the display areas. [See, Application at page 2, lines 19-27.] One advantage is that a user can drag a sizing control through the use of a mouse and have the sizes of a plurality of display panes automatically change. [See, Application at page 10, line 27 to page 11, line 3.] Another advantage is that multiple independent web pages may be simultaneously displayed [see, Application at page 7, lines 4-9] and individual navigation tools used for each display area [see, e.g., Application at page 8, line 23 to page 9, line 22; FIG. 2.]

For example, FIG. 2 shows an exemplary screen display 210 comprising four display panes 212a-d displaying four web pages and a sizing control 216 which allows the control of all four display panes simultaneously. [See, Application at page 10, lines 19-20.] FIG. 3 shows an additional example, as the sizing control 216 can be moved to a different position, adjusting the sizes of all four display panes. [See, Application at page 11, lines 3-6.]

The claims also include those directed to a display system for displaying web pages in a plurality of display areas, the web pages taken from a list of web page sites. [See, Application at page 16, lines 12-18; page 19, line 23 to page 24, line 9; FIG. 11, FIG. 16, FIG. 17.] One advantage is that a user can scroll through a list of web sites through the use of forward and back scrolling controls, allowing the user to control how he or she accesses pre-selected web sites. [See, Application at page 16, lines 15-18.]

For example, FIG. 16 shows a URL list 1610 of web page sites. FIG. 18 shows a pop-down list which can allow a user to go directly to a URL from the list 1610. [See Application at page 20, lines 14-17.] In another example, FIG. 11 shows a ScrollMarks menu 1110 comprising a Scroll Forward selection 1116 and a Scroll Back selection 1118, which allow a user to scroll through the web pages of the URL list 1610. [See, Application at page 20, lines 17-19]

VI. ISSUES

A. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claims 1-23 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

B. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claims 25-35 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

C. Whether Helfman describes each and every element of claim 24 as required under 35 U.S.C. 102(e).

VII. GROUPING OF CLAIMS

For reasons detailed below, each of the independent claims 1, 9, 19, 24, 25, and 30 is independently allowable. The dependent claims each contain limitations that further distinguish over the art of record. However, since the limitations of the independent claims are sufficient to distinguish this art, and to facilitate the Board's consideration of this appeal, Applicants group the claims for purposes of this appeal as follows.

The patentability of claims 2-23 stand or fall with the patentability of claim 1.

The patentability of claims 26-35 stand or fall with the patentability of claim 25.

The patentability of claim 24 stands or falls on its own.

VIII. ARGUMENT

A. The Cited Art – U.S. Patent 6,119,135 to Helfman (“Helfman”)

Helfman describes a passive internet-browsing method which displays images from web pages on a user's display. [See Helfman at abstract.] A web browser can be driven to go to a web page by clicking on a displayed image. [See Helfman at abstract.] To allow for this, a mapping list is maintained that maps the Uniform Resource Locator (“URL”) for each image to the URL for a website. [See Helfman at abstract.] The images can be displayed either in a so-called “non-overlapping” pattern or a random pattern which allows overlapping images. Additionally, the images can be displayed according to their size. [See Helfman at column 3, lines 25-30, FIGS. 1-2.]

At column 2, line 60 to column 3, line 4, Helfman describes differences between displaying images and displaying web pages:

In accordance with the present invention, a user ... can have web page images 10 displayed on computer screen 12, as shown in FIG. 1.... If the user observes an image of interest, the user can select that image by clicking on the image When an image is selected, the user's web browser is automatically

driven to the web page associated with the image. The user can browse the World Wide Web starting with that page.

Helfman, at column 3, lines 25-32, further describes that the images displayed on the screen may alternatively be displayed in multiple ways, including so-called “overlapping” or “non-overlapping” manners:

If desired, web page images 14 can be displayed on computer display screen 16 in a non-overlapping pattern, as shown in FIG. 2. The pattern of FIG. 2 uses standard two-dimensional bin-packing algorithms to avoid the overlap associated with the random placement approach of FIG. 1. Another suitable display technique involves displaying images according to size (e.g., placing the largest images in the center of the display).

Helfman later describes, at column 3, lines 62-65, a “montage application” which “displays the images on the display of client 32 in a random pattern (e.g. as shown in FIG. 1), a so-called “non-overlapping pattern” (e.g., as shown in FIG. 2), or in some other suitable arrangement.

Helfman also describes a “mapping list that maps the URL for each image listed in the log file to the URL of the web page associated with that image” at column 4, lines 33-35. Helfman describes that the mapping list is used to display a single web page when an image is selected at column 4, lines 57-62:

If a user selects an image by clicking at a certain coordinate, montage application 40 determines which image has been selected from the list of coordinates maintained during process 54 and uses the mapping list constructed during process 50 to drive web browser 36 to the web page that contains the selected image at step 58.

B. Rejections of Claims 1-23 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)

1. Independent Claim 1 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman

Claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by Helfman.

Claim 1 is directed to a display system for displaying web pages accessible via a network comprising a computer system, a display, and a sizing control. The computer system is configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web pages sites and to receive web pages via the network from web page sites. [See, e.g., Application at page 6, lines 20-22.]

The display has display controls and a plurality of non-overlapping display areas having adjustable sizes, the plurality of non-overlapping display areas having a collective size equal to

the sum of the non-overlapping display areas. [See, e.g., Application at page 7, lines 20-24; FIG. 2.] Additionally, each non-overlapping display area has independent display area controls and is configured to independently display a web page received by the computer. [See e.g., Application at page 7, line 25 to page 8, line 5; FIG. 2.]

The sizing control is operable by a user to adjust the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action while maintaining the collective size of the plurality of non-overlapping display areas. [See, e.g., Application at page 10, lines 19-20; page 11, line 24 to page 12, line 16; FIG. 3.]

Helfman does not anticipate claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §102(e). "A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP §2131. Because Helfman does not describe each and every element of claim 1, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) of claim 1 should be reversed.

a. Helfman's Passage About Displaying Web Page Images Does Not Describe Display Areas Along with a Sizing Control Operable by a User to Simultaneously Adjust the Display Area Sizes While Maintaining Their Collective Size

Claim 1 recites in part:

a sizing control operable by a user to adjust the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action while maintaining the collective size of the plurality of non-overlapping areas.

For example, the Application at FIG. 2 shows a sizing control 216 which is operable by a user to control the sizing of all four illustrated display panes 212a-d. If the sizing control is moved by a user, the size of the display panes 212a-d is automatically adjusted so that the intersection of the common corners of the display panes 212a-d continues to be the position of the moved sizing control. [See Application at page 10, lines 19-20; page 11, lines 3-6.] The Application at FIG. 3 shows an additional example where the sizing control has been moved by a user, causing the display panes 212a-d to automatically resize accordingly. [See Application at page 11, lines 19-25.]

The rejection of claim 1 in the September 25, 2003, Office Action cites to a section of Helfman that discusses displaying images in a so-called "non-overlapping" pattern, storage and

retrieval of images from an image cache, and a “montage application” which creates a list mapping URLs of images to URLs of web pages:

If desired, web page images 14 can be displayed on computer display screen 16 in a non-overlapping pattern, as shown in FIG. 2. The pattern of FIG. 2 uses standard two-dimensional bin-packing algorithms to avoid the overlap associated with the random placement approach of FIG. 1. Another suitable display technique involves displaying images according to size (e.g., placing the largest images in the center of the display).

Images may be obtained from an image cache using system 18 of FIG. 3. In system 18, multiple clients are clustered together to form a local area network 20. Web servers 22 and 24, which are connected to a data network such as the Internet 26 or an intranet, supply web pages to clients 28, 30, and 32. Clients 28, 30, and 32 are connected to the Internet 26 through proxy server 34. Proxy servers are typically used in organizations that wish to provide a firewall machine between clients in a local area network and the Internet. Clients 28, 30, and 32 in local area network 20 contain standard web browsers, such as web browser 36 on client 32. Each web browser is configured to use proxy server 34 as its proxy server. When users browse the Internet 26, the web browsers request web pages from the proxy server 34. Proxy server 34 stores requested web pages and the images contained in or referenced from those web pages in cache 38. If no local copy of a requested page exists in cache 38 of proxy server 34, proxy server 34 retrieves the requested web page from the appropriate web server 22 or 24 via the Internet 26. Proxy server 38 also maintains a standard log file containing the URLs of the stored web pages and images.

A montage application, such as montage application 40 on client 32, may run on each client in local area network 20, but is illustrated only as running on client 32 to avoid over-complicating the drawing. Montage application 40 parses the log file maintained by proxy server 38 and creates a corresponding mapping list containing the URLs of the images in cache 38 and the URLs of the web pages associated with those images. Montage application 40 displays the images on the display of client 32 in a random pattern (e.g., as shown in FIG. 1), a non-overlapping pattern (e.g., as shown in FIG. 2), or in some other suitable arrangement.

[Helfman at column 3, lines 25-65; emphasis added.] Applicants fail to understand how the cited language in any way describes a sizing control, let alone one that allows a user to simultaneously adjust display areas while maintaining the areas’ collective size. Helfman does describe displaying web page images by size in the emphasized paragraph above and in the Summary at column 3, lines 25-32. But the discussion appears to be limited to techniques for automatic image layout, and not a sizing control which allows a user to adjust display area sizes simultaneously.

Finally, while the Action does not present an inherency argument, Applicants note for the sake of completeness that the techniques of Helfman can operate without allowing a user to adjust display area sizes using a sizing control. Therefore, the claimed arrangement is not necessarily present in Helfman and is thus not inherently described. *See Schering Corp. v. Geneva Pharms., Inc.*, 339 F.3d 1373; 67 USPQ 2d 1664 (Fed. Cir. 2003).

b. Helfman's Passage on a Plurality of Images from Web Pages Does Not Describe a Plurality of Display Areas Configured to Display Web Pages

Claim 1 recites in part:

a plurality of non-overlapping display areas ... each non-overlapping display area ... configured to independently display a web page received by the computer; and

a sizing control operable by a user to adjust the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action while maintaining the collective size of the plurality of non-overlapping areas.

The Application at FIG. 2, FIG. 3, and FIG. 4 shows the display of a plurality of web pages.

As mentioned above, in the rejection of claim 1, the Office Action cites to column 3, lines 25-65 of Helfman. While this section of Helfman describes displaying "web page images," it limits its description to a display of images. The section nowhere describes a plurality of display areas which are configured to display *web pages*. And while the section cited does discuss proxy servers which request web pages, it does not discuss display of those web pages where the plurality of images are displayed, but rather that the images come *from* the web pages. [See, Helfman at column 3, lines 25-32, lines 35-54.] None of Helfman's drawings show, and the text does not describe, that the web page images are configured to display web pages.

Further, Helfman's passage describing driving a browser to a web page does not describe a plurality of display areas, each configured to display a web page along with a sizing control operable by a user to simultaneously adjust the sizes of the areas. Where Helfman does discuss the display of a web page, it does so by describing the use of a single web browser to display a single web page:

If a user selects an image by clicking at a certain coordinate, montage application 40 determines which image has been selected from the list of coordinates maintained during process 54 and uses the mapping list constructed during process 50 to drive web browser 36 to the web page that contains the selected image at step 58.

[Helfman, column 4, lines 57-62.] At column 3, lines 42-44, Helfman describes the web browser 36 as being a “standard web browser.” Thus, display of web pages, as described by Helfman, are performed outside of the displayed images and through a single web browser. Even if Helfman’s web browser did describe such a plurality of display areas, Applicants still cannot find where Helfman describes a plurality of display areas along with the sizing control operable by a user to adjust their sizes.

For at least these reasons, the final rejection of claim 1 should be reversed.

2. Independent Claims 9 and 19 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman

Claims 9 and 19 each contain language that is not described in Helfman.

Claim 9 recites in part:

a display having display controls and a plurality of non-overlapping display areas, each display area having independent display area controls and configured to independently display a web page, each display area having a size; and

a sizing control operable by a user to alter the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action.

For reasons similar to those presented for claim 1, Helfman does not describe the claimed language.

Claim 19 recites in part:

displaying the requested web pages wherein the requested web pages are displayed in a non-overlapping manner in display area having a size;

changing the size of a first web page displayed in response to a sizing control command; and

resizing the web pages other than the first web page to maintain the size of the display area of all of the web pages.

For reasons similar to those presented for claim 1, Helfman does not describe the claimed language. For at least these reasons, the final rejection of claims 9 and 19 should be reversed.

3. Dependent Claims 2-8, 10-18, and 20-23 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman

Claims 2-8, 10-18, and 20-23 each depend from one of claims 1, 9, or 19. For the sake of brevity, Applicants do not present separate arguments for all the dependent claims, which are allowable at least because their associated independent claims are allowable. The final rejection of claims 2-8, 10-18, and 20-23 should be reversed.

C. Rejections of Claims 25-30 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)

1. Independent Claim 25 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman

a. Helfman's Passage on the Use of Lists of URLs Does Not Describe Display Areas Each Displaying a Web Page from a List of Web Page Sites

Claim 25 recites, in part:

a display control configured to activate a group of the display areas to each display a web page from a list of web page sites.

The Application provides examples of such a display control and list of web page sites. For example, FIG. 11 shows a StartScrollShow selection 1114 which causes the first four web pages of a list of web page URLs to appear. [See Application at page 16, lines 13-15.] FIG. 16 and FIG. 17 show examples of lists of URLs which can be scrolled through using the Scroll Forward selection 1116 and Scroll Back selection 1118 of Figure 11. [See Application at page 20, lines 17-19.]

The rejection of claim 25 cites column 7, lines 6-61 of Helfman. While the cited section discusses lists, it is entirely directed toward the display of images from web pages, rather than displaying web pages from a list. For example, Helfman describes:

In process 106, the image for each image URL in the mapping list is retrieved.... Whenever an image has been completely retrieved, that image is placed on a list of completely retrieved images.

In process 108, montage application 88 displays the completely retrieved images from the list on the display of client 76 and maintains a list of the coordinates for each displayed image....

If a user selects an image by clicking at a coordinate within the image, montage application 88 determines the image URL for the selected image from the list of image coordinates maintained in process 108 and uses the mapping list constructed in process 104 to drive web browser 84 to the web page that contains the selected image at step 114.

[Helfman at column 7, lines 6-24.] Additionally, part of the cited section describes "using system 116 to display web page images and access the web pages associated with those images" [Helfman at column 7, lines 57-59.] As both of these sections describe, Helfman is directed toward the display of a plurality of images taken from a list of URLs, which then allow a user to cause a web browser to display a web page. Nowhere does Helfman describe using a

list of web page sites to activate a group of display areas to display web pages. Thus, Helfman does not describe the recited language of claim 25.

Helfman does not inherently describe display areas each displaying a web page from a list of web sites, either. As mentioned above, for an inherency rejection, the missing descriptive matter must be necessarily present in the reference. Applicants note, however, that Helfman only describes the display of images from web sites and it is not necessary to display web pages from a list of web sites in order to display these images. Thus, Helfman does not inherently describe the recited language of claim 25, nor does it explicitly describe it.

b Helfman's Passage About a Plurality of Images Does Not Describe a Plurality of Display Areas Configured to Independently Display a Web Page

Claim 25 also recites in part:

a display having a plurality of display areas configured to independently display a web page received by the computer; and
a display control configured to activate a group of the display areas to each display a web page from a list of web page sites.

For reasons similar to those presented in the argument concerning display areas configured to display web pages for claim 1, above, as well as for the reasons presented above concerning display areas each displaying a web page, Helfman does not describe this claimed language. For this reason, as well as those above, the final rejection of claim 25 should be reversed.

2. Independent Claim 30 Is Not Anticipated by Helfman

Claim 30 also contains language that is not described in Helfman.

Claim 30 recites in part:

a computer system configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web page sites, the computer system configured to receive web pages via the network from web page sites based upon a selected list of the stored web page sites in the data storage area; and
a display having a plurality of display areas, each display area configured to independently display a web page received by the computer.

For reasons similar to those presented for claims 1 and 25, Helfman does not describe the claimed language. For at least these reasons, the final rejection of claim 30 should be reversed.

3. Dependent Claims 26-29 and 31-35 Are Not Anticipated by Helfman

Claims 26-29 and 31-35 each depend from claim 25 or claim 30. For the sake of brevity, Applicants do not present separate arguments for all the dependent claims, which are allowable at least because their associated independent claims are allowable. The final rejection of claims 26-29 and 31-35 should be reversed.

D. Rejection of Claim 24 as Anticipated by Helfman Under § 102(e)

Helfman's passage on a plurality of images does not describe a plurality of display areas configured to independently display a web page. Claim 24 also contains language that is not described in Helfman.

Claim 24 recites in part:

a display having a plurality of non-overlapping display areas configured to independently display a web page received by the computer.

Claim 24 also recites in part:

a second software program configured to display the web pages in the non-overlapping display areas while a plurality of web pages are independently displayed in the plurality of the non-overlapping display areas.


For reasons similar to those presented in the argument concerning display areas configured to display web pages for claim 1, above, Helfman does not describe the claimed language. For at least these reasons, the final rejection of claim 24 should be reversed.

IX. CONCLUSION

Helfman fails to describe each and every element of claims 1-35. Accordingly, the rejection of these claims should be reversed and all claims passed to issue.

Respectfully submitted,

KLARQUIST SPARKMAN, LLP

By 
Gregory L. Maurer
Registration No. 43,781

One World Trade Center, Suite 1600
121 S.W. Salmon Street
Portland, Oregon 97204
Telephone: (503) 226-7391
Facsimile: (503) 228-9446

(91218.2)

APPENDIX A
CLAIMS ON APPEAL

1. A display system for displaying web pages accessible via a network, the display system comprising:

a computer system configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web page sites, the computer system configured to receive web pages via the network from web page sites;

a display having display controls and a plurality of non-overlapping display areas having adjustable sizes, the plurality of non-overlapping display areas having a collective size equal to the sum of the non-overlapping display areas, each non-overlapping display area having independent display area controls and configured to independently display a web page received by the computer; and

a sizing control operable by a user to adjust the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action while maintaining the collective size of the plurality of non-overlapping display areas.

2. The display system of claim 1 wherein the computer system executes only one instance of a software program involved with sending the web page requests and receiving and displaying web pages.

3. The display system of claim 1 wherein the computer system includes a modem for accessing the network.

4. The display system of claim 1 wherein the computer system includes a network controller for accessing the network.

5. The display system of claim 1 wherein the display controls are configured to activate a group of the display areas to display a web page from a list of web page sites selected from a plurality of lists of web page sites, the computer configured to store the plurality of lists of web page sites.

6. The display system of claim 5 wherein the display controls include a control configured to designate a display area as not being part of the group of the display areas.

7. The display system of claim 5 wherein each display area of the group of display areas displays in a predetermined order a web page from the selected list of web page sites.

8. The display system of claim 7 wherein the selected list of web sites has a sequence and the predetermined order of display for one display area is different from the sequence of the selected list of web sites.

9. A display system for displaying web pages, the display system comprising:

a display having display controls and a plurality of non-overlapping display areas, each display area having independent display area controls and configured to independently display a web page, each display area having a size; and

a sizing control operable by a user to alter the sizes of the display areas simultaneously with one control action.

10. The system of claim 9, further including a software program configured to be executed in one instance to provide support including communications support for all of the display areas.

11. The system of claim 9 wherein the sizing control includes a graphical object on the display and the one control action is movement of the graphical object by the user using an input device.

12. The system of claim 9 wherein a total area of the plurality of non-overlapping display areas remains constant.

13. The system of claim 9 wherein the display controls of the display includes a designator control operable by a user to designate the number of the plurality of non-overlapping display areas.

14. The system of claim 9 wherein the display controls of the display comprises refresh, stop, home, and search controls.

15. The system of claim 9 wherein the independent display area controls each comprise controls selected from a list of controls comprising back, forward, stop, refresh, search, and web page selection.

16. The system of claim 9 wherein the web page include Internet web pages.

17. The system of claim 9 wherein the display controls of the display include a drag and drop control, the drag and drop control configured to drag and drop a uniform reference locator from a first display area into a second display area, the second display area configured to display a web page associated with the dropped uniform reference locator.

18. The system of claim 9 wherein the display controls of the display include a drag and drop control, the drag and drop control configured to drag and drop a uniform reference locator from a portion of the display other than the overlapping display areas into a display area, the display area configured to display a web page associated with the dropped uniform reference locator.

19. A method of displaying web pages comprising:
requesting web pages from web page sites;
receiving the requested web pages from web page sites;

displaying the requested web pages wherein the requested web pages are displayed in a non-overlapping manner in display area having a size;
changing the size of a first web page displayed in response to a sizing control command; and
resizing the web pages other than the first web page to maintain the size of the display area of all of the web pages.

20. The method of claim 19, further comprising:
dragging a uniform resource locator from a portion of the display;
dropping the uniform resource locator on to one of the displayed web pages; and
displaying a web page from a web page site associated with the uniform resource locator.

21. The method of claim 19, further including:
executing only one instance of a software program that manages the method of displaying web pages.

22. The method of claim 19 wherein requesting web pages is done with one control action for all requested web pages.

23. The method of claim 19, further comprising:
selecting a uniform resource locator with a single action of an input device controlling a cursor;
repositioning the cursor over one of the displayed web pages; and
displaying a web page from a web page site associated with the uniform resource locator.

24. A display system for displaying web pages accessible via a network, the display system comprising:

a computer system configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web page sites, the computer system configured to receive web pages via the network from web page sites;

a display having a plurality of non-overlapping display areas configured to independently display a web page received by the computer;

a first software program configured to provide instructions to send the web page requests and to receive web pages with the computer system using only one instance of the software program; and

a second software program configured to display the web pages in the non-overlapping display areas while a plurality of web pages are independently displayed in the plurality of the non-overlapping display areas.

25. A display system for displaying web pages accessible via a network, the display system comprising:

a computer system configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web page sites, the computer system configured to receive web pages via the network from web page sites;

a display having a plurality of display areas configured to independently display a web page received by the computer; and

a display control configured to activate a group of the display areas to each display a web page from a list of web page sites.

26. The display system of claim 25 wherein the display control is further configured to select the list of web page sites from a plurality of lists of web page sites, the computer system configured to store the plurality of lists of web page sites.

27. The display system of claim 25 wherein each display area of the group of display areas displays in a predetermined order a web page from the list of web page sites.

28. The display system of claim 25 wherein the list of web page sites has a sequence and each display area has a predetermined order of display of web page sites from the list of web page sites, the predetermined order of display for one display area being independent from the sequence of the list of web page sites.

29. A display system of claim 25 wherein the display control is configured to provide control of the group of the display areas, the control to be selected from a list of controls comprising sizing, refresh, stop, home, scrolling, and search controls.

30. A display system for displaying web pages accessible via a network, the display system comprising:

a data storage area to store a list of web page sites;

a computer system configured to send requests for web pages via the network to web page sites, the computer system configured to receive web pages via the network from web page sites based upon a selected list of the stored web page sites in the data storage area; and

a display having a plurality of display areas, each display area configured to independently display a web page received by the computer.

31. The display system of claim 30, further comprising a selection control configured to select a first set of web pages to be displayed in the display areas from the list of stored web page sites in the data storage area, the number of web pages of the first set being less than or equal to the number of display areas in the plurality of display areas, the selection control configured to subsequently select a second set of web pages to be displayed from the list of stored web page sites in the data storage area.

32. The display system of claim 31 wherein at least one of the web pages in the first set of web pages is also present in the second set of web pages.

33. The display system of claim 31, further comprising a display control configured to assign for display each web page from the first set of web pages to a selected

one of the plurality of display areas according to an order of the first set of web pages and an order of the display areas, the display control configured to subsequently assign for display each web page from the second set of web pages to the selected display area to replace the web page assigned from the first set of web pages.

34. The display system of claim 30, further comprising a scroll control configured to control an advancement of display of web pages from a list of web pages, the web pages being displayed on selected display areas of the plurality of display areas according to an order of the list, the scroll control sequentially shifting at least one web page from the selected display area to a different selected display area.

35. The display system of claim 34, further comprising a scroll lock control configured to designate a selected display area of the plurality of display areas for which no sequential shifting will occur.